The Washington Union.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."

VOL. XIV. NO. 163. WASHINGTON CITY, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1858. TWO CENTS.

THE WASHINGTON UNION,
Published by CORNELIUS WENDELL,
At the UNION BUILDINGS, E st., bet. 11th and 12th.

THE DAILY UNION will be published every morning, (Mondays excepted,) and delivered to city subscribers at 12½ cts per week, payable to the collector. To subscribers by mail, at $6 per annum; $3 for six months. Officers of the government, not paying in advance, will be charged $8 per annum.

THE SEMI-WEEKLY UNION, will be published every Wednesday and Saturday, at $4 per annum for one copy; $10 for three copies; and $15 for five copies.

THE WEEKLY UNION, a very large paper for country circulation, will be published every Saturday morning, at the following prices: For one copy, $2 per annum; three copies for $5; five copies for $8; ten copies for $15; twenty copies, *sent to one address*, $25. Subscriptions may commence at any time.

THE POLITICS OF THE DAY.

REMARKS OF HON. R. H. GILLET,

AT CANTON,

On the 7th of October, 1858.

[From the Potsdam (N. Y.) Courier and Journal.]

[CONCLUDED.]

MOTIVES AND ACTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON THE KANSAS SUBJECT.

The administration, desirous of promoting the welfare of Kansas, and securing the peace and harmony of the country, turned its attention to the subject in which both Kansas and the whole Union were deeply interested. It wished to put an end to the controversies and conflicts in the Territory, and to relieve Congress and the country from further agitation, which was deeply injurious to Kansas, and productive of nothing but evil everywhere. What was the President's duty under the existing circumstances? The convention had been legally called; the election of delegates had been regular, and in accordance with law. In framing the constitution the delegates acted under responsibility to their constituents, and no complaint was heard of its provisions, except those which related to slavery, and those had been so submitted that all could vote, and had not been rejected. The mode of submission, though not wholly conformable to his views, nor such as he would have advised, was in violation of no law or constitutional requirement. It was the work of the people of Kansas, who were willing to act under the forms of law, managing their own affairs in their own way, through delegates of their own selection. So stood the official record before him. On receiving this constitution under such circumstances, the President, mindful of his constitutional duty, and paying due respect to the wishes of the people, who desired a termination of a controversy that had long seriously obstructed the necessary business of Congress and been fruitful of nothing but evil, deemed it his duty to communicate it to Congress, with a recommendation to make provision to admit Kansas as a State, as the best mode of terminating all strife and contention. If her people were really dissatisfied with anything in the constitution, her legislature, known to be largely republican, could authorize another convention, and clothe it with power to make such changes as were desired, and all in her own way. Congress made no attempt to force the Lecompton constitution upon Kansas, but simply provided for the admission upon the condition that the constitution and certain provisions concerning the public lands should be submitted to the people of Kansas for approval or rejection. The republicans opposed this measure, and for the professed but strange reason, that the former submission had not included the whole constitution, but only the slavery part, but mainly because their friends had refused to vote on the former submission when they claimed the ability to defeat it. A majority of both houses of Congress determined that Kansas ought to be admitted, provided her people would sanction the constitution which had been presented, and assent to certain conditions concerning the public domain within her limits, and the President approved this determination. No effort was made to force the constitution upon the people of Kansas, nor did the President and his friends recommend or desire anything of the kind. Both he and they would have resisted any such attempt with as much sincerity and zeal as any republican. What they desired was to give Kansas a full and fair opportunity to act, and accept or reject the constitution and terms of the proposed admission. The President had no desire to extend slavery, or increase the number of slave States. His State had abolished slavery long years ago, and he approved her action, and did not desire it changed. The question of slavery or no slavery he believed rested solely with the majority of the people of a State, under the powers reserved to them in the federal constitution, and that the consequences, whether good or bad, must fall upon them, and he had no power or desire to interfere or control. He believed that each State had the constitutional right to control its own local and domestic affairs in its own way, and that neither he nor Congress had any power or authority to prevent them. The action of Congress submitted this, as well as all other questions involved, to the people of Kansas.

WHAT THE REPUBLICANS ADVISED KANSAS.

When Congress provided for the submission of the question of admission to the people of Kansas, the republicans, in and out of Congress, advised them to reject these measures and refuse to be admitted, and doubtless for the distinct purpose of making Kansas matters the subject of further agitation. This is proved by the fact that they neglect to consider and act upon the glaring matters of abuse and complaint at and near home, while they intermeddle with those of that Territory. Why agitate Kansas affairs? The republicans have the legislature there, and all the elective offices in the counties where they have the majority. Their laws are, it is now conceded, legally and fairly administered. Peace reigns within her borders. The legislature can repeal objectionable laws if any exist, and make such as they deem best. Why not, then, let Kansas attend to her own affairs in her own way? The answer is obvious. Unless further agitation can be secured there, the life-blood of the republican party will stagnate and curdle, and its death must speedily follow. The prediction is hazarded, that the effort will be perseveringly made by that party to renew agitation upon the affairs of Kansas. The republican resolutions of Syracuse seem to have no other real object in view. But the effort will utterly fail, unless sufficient means are raised to induce the former brigands to resume their work of plunder, carnage, and death.

WHAT KANSAS CAN AND PROBABLY WILL DO IF LEFT TO HERSELF.

If she chooses to resort to them, Kansas has the means of coming into the Union as a sovereign and independent State, with such a constitution as her people choose to make, under which she can manage her domestic affairs as she sees fit. She has the power under her organic act, and so the Topeka men in Congress held, and the republicans in Congress declared, to enact a law authorizing a convention to form a constitution. She has also express power to do so, under the present act called English's bill, if her population is sufficient to entitle her to a member of the House of Representatives, which the republicans allege that she now has, as she doubtless will have by the time she can form and present a constitution. If the organic act was not enabling law, though I think it clearly is, and is not repealed by the English bill, this is indisputably one, and no one can question her power to act, if she chooses, and she can do so as freely as any State can control her own affairs. If she wishes to enjoy the privileges and burdens of a State government, she has only to go through the usual forms to be entitled to do so, and as early as she can conform her constitution and present herself, Congress stands pledged, by statute, to admit her without regard to the question of slavery, and neither the President nor any democrat will dispute her right when she presents herself in the usual way. It is understood that the majority of her people prefer her being a free State, which she has the right to be, if such is her wish, either when forming and presenting her constitution, or at any time thereafter. And certainly there has been no period, since her population was deemed sufficient to entitle her to admission, when she could not thus have been admitted, if the republicans out of her limits had not intermeddled, and prevented a portion of her people from expressing their wishes through the ballot-box, and thus occasioned embarrassments and all manner of difficulties. This outside interference has brought upon Kansas the evils and calamities with which she has been afflicted, and upon the country the agitation and excitement which has so much disturbed public quiet and happiness. If left to themselves, the people of Kansas will form institutions to suit themselves, and establish a flourishing State to be filled with useful and happy people, which all good citizens must earnestly desire. If republican demagogues interfere, as they doubtless will, and their advice shall be followed, they will neither enjoy peace, quiet, nor happiness at home, nor command respect anywhere.

FALSE ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRACY.

The democracy have been assailed for acquiescing in the Dred Scott decision. This assault could only prove successful by resort to gross misrepresentations of the decision itself. Hence, it has been pertinaciously misrepresented, and misstated and misquoted by republican journals and orators. It has been represented as denying the negro the right to sue in any court. This is wholly untrue. There is nothing of the kind in the decision. No one contends for anything of the kind, as those who have read the decision actually know. Decisions of the Supreme Court will show cases, before and since the Dred Scott decision, where the right of colored men to sue, in the federal courts, has been conceded and upheld, where it did not depend upon citizenship. Every well-informed lawyer knows that in every other possible case all the national courts, as well as all the State courts, and those in the District of Columbia, are open to the negro without limitation or restriction, and nothing to the contrary appears in the Dred Scott decision. It has been also stated thousands of times over that Chief Justice Taney decided that "the negro had no rights which the white man was bound to respect." There is nothing like this in his opinion, nor in that of any other member of the court. What he did say, when stating historical facts, as to opinions once entertained by the British and colonial government and in many other countries, was this: That "they had for more than a century before (the declaration of independence) been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect, and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for this benefit." No candid man will pretend that this statement of a well-known historical fact is a declaration or decision indicating the present legal relations or rights of the African. It is not stated as being now the law, or as a present rule of action in this country, and we know it is not. The chief justice doubtless had in his mind the facts stated in Bancroft's History, that the King of Spain and a Queen of England were interested in an English company that contracted to introduce into the West Indian American colonies 144,000 slaves within thirty years, and that this was not only recognised by a treaty between the governments which conferred on the English a monopoly of that trade, but also to the fact that Justice Holt and his brother judges and other distinguished lawyers, including an English attorney general, gave it as their opinion, that such slaves were lawful property under the laws of England.

The above misquotation from the opinion of the Chief Justice is a vile slander upon one of the kindest hearted and purest men that live, and who educated and conferred freedom, long years ago, upon the slaves whom he inherited from his father, and he does not now own one, nor has he for many years. It comes with a peculiar bad grace from those who are now supporting for a seat in Congress a man whose sympathies for the negro are manifested by an open declaration that he would abolish slavery at the expense of annihilating the whole African race, which certainly would be a very effectual mode of accomplishing that object. Real sympathy for the negro forms no portion of the motives of the leaders of that party, as is proved by the recorded desire to transplant him to the sickly regions of Central America, where he would meet starvation and speedily find a grave from the effects of its deadly climate.

THE DRED SCOTT DECISION, AND WHAT IT IS.

No action of any tribunal has been so little understood or more misrepresented than this decision. The republican press has condemned, without publishing it, so that it might speak for itself, while they have spread broadcast the dissenting opinions. I know of but five papers in the Union that have published it entire. The case was this: Dred Scott was originally a slave in Missouri, and had been taken by his master first into Illinois, (a free State,) and afterwards into the Louisiana purchase, north of the Missouri compromise line, and then returned to Missouri. These facts he insisted made him free after his return. After abandoning a suit where the ruling was against him in the State court, he brought one claiming his freedom in the United States circuit court for the district of Missouri, claiming jurisdiction for that court upon the ground that he was a citizen under the constitution and laws of the United States. In the circuit court the decision was against him on the merits. He brought it to the Supreme Court, where it was conceded by his counsel that if he was not such a citizen the court below had no jurisdiction, and insisted that the Supreme Court must reverse the judgment upon that ground, while it was admitted on both sides, and conceded by the court, that his rights could be asserted in the State and territorial courts, wherever the defendant could be found and served with process. His counsel insisted:

1st. That his master, by taking him into Illinois and into the territory north of the compromise line, made him free.

2d. And that, if free, the fact of his being free constituted him a citizen of one of these places, and therefore a citizen of the United States, and consequently the circuit court had jurisdiction.

These questions were twice elaborately argued by his counsel in the Supreme Court, and were considered and discussed by all the judges, who give opinions, including the two who dissented, the whole court concurring that these questions were before them, and they were accordingly decided by the court in its final judgment. The court had to pass upon the first question before the other could properly arise. Scott did not pretend he could be a citizen unless he established the fact that he was free; and, if he was not a citizen, he conceded that his case should have been dismissed below for want of jurisdiction in the circuit court to adjudicate upon it. The court held, as they did seven years before in Strader *vs.* Graham, (10 Howard, 82:)

1st. That on returning from a free State (Illinois) to Missouri, under the laws of the latter State, as settled by her highest tribunals, (which, under the constitution and laws of the United States, they were bound to follow, as they had many times previously and unanimously decided,) he was a slave, and not free, and therefore, under the theory of his counsel, he could not be a citizen.

2d. That on his return from the Territory north of the Compromise line to Missouri he was not free for the same and for an additional reason—to wit: That, under the constitution of the United States, Congress had no authority to pass the act establishing that line, and, therefore, while north of it, he was not in the territory where slavery was prohibited, and, consequently, going there did not confer freedom upon him. It followed that, not being free, he was not, under the argument of his counsel, a citizen, and therefore the court below could not lawfully entertain jurisdiction. It might have been truly added, as the entire democracy of St. Lawrence held in 1844, as shown by their printed resolutions, that by the third article of the treaty of 1803, by which we acquired that territory, we guarantied to the people in it the inviolability of their property, which in part consisted of slaves, which imposed an obligation that Congress could not annul. The ruling upon these questions necessarily resulted in annulling the judgment below, which, as recorded, was a conclusive one against him, and the entry of one more favorable by reversing the judgment below, and directing the circuit court to dismiss the case for want of jurisdiction, without directly decreeing for or against Scott's freedom, though incidentally in determining the question of citizenship it was held that the facts relied upon by him did not prove him to be free. He was left at liberty to assert his rights in the State courts. The court was of the opinion that the States might confer whatever rights they pleased, not incompatible with the federal constitution, upon persons within their respective limits, but that they could not constitute them citizens of the United States, so as to entitle them to sue as such in the federal courts, where jurisdiction depended solely upon citizenship; and they were also of opinion, and assigned it as a further reason for the same conclusion, that African slaves, and descendants of such slaves, could not, under the national constitution and laws, become such citizens. The court, in thus expressing their opinions, followed the usual course of judicial as well as all other tribunals, in assigning the reasons that occurred to them, whether one or more, for the conclusion to which such reasons brought them. All men, whether in public or private life, do the same, as our daily intercourse shows. The counsel on both sides discussed these questions, and all the judges considered and gave opinions upon them. If Judges McLean and Curtis were right in considering them before the court, so that it was a matter of duty to give their opinions upon them, as they certainly did, then it was equally as proper for the majority to express their opinions upon the same questions. The court held the compromise act void because the constitution conferred no power upon Congress to create a distinction of rights and privileges on the north and on the south side of a particular line. Scott's counsel claimed that, on being taken north of it, he ceased to be property; yet he admitted while he remained south of it he was the lawful property of his owners; that is, that the act of Congress destroyed existing property north of said line, though it protected it south of it. The court were of opinion that, inasmuch as the constitution of the United States recognised slaves as property, Congress could not enact a law which should deprive an owner of such property, and that, as Congress could not do so itself, it could not authorize a territorial legislature or other agent to do it. If Congress could prohibit a person who had a right to go into a Territory from taking one kind of property, it could exclude all kinds, which no one pretends would be lawful. If the power rests not upon the constitution under the power "to dispose of, and make all needful regulations respecting, the territory and other property belonging to the United States;" but, upon the necessity of governing a conquest or purchase, such necessity cannot extend beyond the protection of property, so as to authorize its distinction, and especially that which is recognised by the constitution. It requires no law of Congress or of a Territory to authorize such property to be brought in, nor can either pass one to destroy or drive it out of a Territory, nor is any needed for its protection there which does not apply to all other property. People often settle in Territories in advance of all legislation and take property with them. When legislation follows, it does not declare that every man shall be permitted to own his property, or that he shall own only certain kinds of it, but simply provides the means of asserting title to all kinds of property. The question of title depends upon lawful acquisition, and is wholly independent of the means of establishing it judicially, and is as valid without as with such means. Affirmative territorial legislation cannot add to the strength of title, nor can it defeat it, whether it create the instrumentalities for judicially asserting it or not. Until a Territory comes in as a State no power exists in it or in Congress to create distinctions in property, or to destroy one portion of it, except perhaps for necessary police purposes. Some States have organized judicial machinery to enable owners to assert their rights to all kinds of property, and others have made exceptions as far as slaves are concerned. Their power to do so is not disputed. When Territories come in as States they may do as they choose, if they do not violate the national constitution.

But before admission they have no power to limit the action of their judiciary to the assertion of rights to one class of property, and to exclude another, which the constitution recognises, because such power is not conferred, nor does it result from necessity. Although I sincerely wish that slavery did not exist in any portion of the United States, or elsewhere, still I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the constitution authorizes its existence, and recognises property in slaves, by providing that "the migration of such persons, as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed upon such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person," and also by providing for return of slaves who may escape from service from one State to another.

History tells us that, without these provisions, the constitution would not have been formed nor the Union established. They are as binding upon us all as any part of our great charter. Neither the power "to dispose of and make needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States," (provided it applies, which I do not believe,) nor the law of necessity, authorizes any such distinction as that now claimed to exist. The question of title is not involved in this judicial machinery, but simply the assertion of it by a court. The title itself goes behind the means contrived for establishing it judicially, and is exclusively a question of evidence, and seldom rests upon statute enactments. But the origin of title and basis of rights to the various kinds of property were not the points of controversy, and were not adjudicated by the Supreme Court, and need not now be discussed.

Scott's counsel conceded that a slave was property as much as any other thing where slavery was not prohibited. The court declared the law resulting from the material facts in the record, and left Dred Scott and his rights where they were before the suit was instituted.

The democrats do not question this decision, but the republicans denounce it as erroneous, and seek to build up a political party upon the mistaken assumption that it is not constitutional or legal.

It will be gratifying to you to learn that a republican member of Congress from Massachusetts, who was Scott's real owner, has since the decision, in compliance with demands upon him by the country, set him free.

REPUBLICAN FALSE PRETENCES.

The republicans allege that they are warring to prevent the extension of slavery into our Territories. This is warring upon the creation of their imaginations. We all know that we have no Territory where a slave owner would now wish to take his slaves. In all of them the climate is an insuperable barrier. And more, no one proposes to extend slavery to any of our Territories, and those who pretend otherwise know that they are practising a deception. Such a thing has not entered the heart of the President. Not a democratic convention anywhere has proposed, suggested or approved such an extension. The assumption is the creation of republican necessity, and has no existence in fact or intention. It is disavowed by the democracy and is wholly without foundation, as those who make the charge must know. The purpose is quite as foreign to my heart as to that of any one of those who make the assumption, while they and I know it to be unfounded, false and deceptive. The republicans profess to be irreconcilably opposed to the admission of another slave State, and this they formerly insisted was one of the objects of their party organization and exertions. That this is not true is demonstrable by the fact that every republican member of both houses of Congress, with perhaps one exception, voted last winter to admit Kansas as a slave State, if she should adopt the Lecompton constitution. Their names stand recorded upon the journal to that effect, including both senators from this State and every republican member representing it who voted at all. The much-lauded amendments of Mr. Crittenden and Mr. Montgomery admitted Kansas with a constitution recognising slavery, if the people should by a majority of votes adopt it. The ground of "no more slave States" was then wholly abandoned by that party, and it was left to the people to come in as a slave State if they should so choose. In this respect, on these particular votes, they came over to the principles of the Kansas organic act and the Cincinnati resolutions, and to the ground occupied by the democratic party from the beginning, and which they still occupy. These votes prove that the cry of "no more slave States," which rung through the Union in 1856, was and is insincere, and intended to deceive and mislead the unsuspecting voters. The object of giving these votes was apparent to all, if not frankly avowed, being a movement to produce a union between the Americans and republicans, which we see the leaders of both of those parties have been endeavoring to form and carry out in all parts of the country.

The republicans assume that their political creed is as firm as the everlasting hills. But we see them change and remodel it daily, omitting former elements, and incorporating new ones, with as much readiness as the conjurer at his shows pours all sorts of liquors out of the same bottle. The assumed opposition to the admission of more slave States was abandoned at Syracuse by the report of the conference committee. Kansas was left to herself, and the only thing of the whole creed of 1856 that it contained was that Congress shall not extend slavery into new Territories, which no one proposes or desires. Not one practical question was then left of all the old republican creed, all having been chopped in pieces and thrown away to please their intended new allies, the Americans. To complete their humiliation, they were compelled, in the attempt to gratify them, to adopt, as a part of their present creed, and to profess to believe, that a portion of our citizens ought not to be allowed the same privileges of voting as are enjoyed by all others. In their own published proceedings it is seen that they descended so low as to consent to deprive American citizens of rights they now enjoy under the State constitution. They consented to believe, or profess to do so, after all their professions of attachment to German, Irish, and other adopted citizens, that they ought to be debarred from voting for a period after they become such. All this was done with the hope of forming a coalition with the Americans, and the latter condescended to accept this concession as equivalent to all their high-sounding denunciation against all foreign born. Human credulity was never yet so gulled as to believe that either of the parties were sincere in any portion of the performance.

Both consented to sacrifice, substantially, all their past professions to secure a combination believed to be of sufficient strength to defeat the democracy, and they shamelessly aver that this is the real object. Unless the rank and file of both parties are as destitute of honest principles as the leaders have avowed and proved themselves to be, the proposed Syracuse bargain and those who offered to make it will be treated with that scorn and contempt which such intentions and efforts are calculated to create. The fate of the national republican and anti-Masonic performance in Utica some years since would have awaited this abortive but attempted imitation. This admission of the want of principle, although the scheme was not carried out, will destroy both of these parties, and secure the ascendency of the democracy.

Massachusetts set the example of abandoning principle to secure a coalition of parties recently professing conflicting principles, and which formerly denounced each other with apparent good-will, telling, no doubt, numerous truths of each other. Honest and close-observing men, doubting the principles of each, were leaving their ranks, and final defeat awaited each, and the only hope of escape rested in fusion, and both rushed into it.

In New York the same parties attempted to follow the precedent. A platform, cut down to four narrow planks, was agreed upon by a joint committee of two separate conventions, which was adopted by both without dissent. The fusion seemed about perfected, when, contrary to all good faith and every principle of fairness, the republicans, thinking they had the Americans completely in their hands, enlarged their platform, and extended it to points to which they knew the Americans could not assent, and which was in fraud of their previous arrangements. This bad faith aroused the Americans to a full consideration of their relations with the republicans. They arrived at the conclusion that an attempt had been made to entrap and cage them, and that nothing but a speedy retreat could save them from annihilation and enduring disgrace. The proposed arrangements were broken off, each convention made its own nominations, and erected its own platform, and denounced each other, applying striking but severe epithets, the propriety of which I am not disposed to question. In the effort to fuse, each went so far to accommodate the other, that little of the original creed of either could be found in the basis agreed upon. The proceedings clearly proved that both were willing to sacrifice past professions to increase present hopes. The union would have been perfected but for the efforts of the republicans to swallow or absorb their new allies—a mode of compensating them for yielding so much of their past professions, at which, it seems, they took exceptions, but of which the democracy do not complain. There is one point continually prominent in the proceedings of all republican conventions, and that is an all-absorbing desire to control the public offices of the State and national governments. They manifest a willingness to profess any belief and to fuse with every description of partisans and to pursue any line of policy which they think will secure that result. They propose no affirmative measures—no new laws are suggested for enactment, nor old ones for repeal. The great thing proposed is the overthrow of the democracy and installing themselves in power. No specific charge is made against the administration which they propose to remedy by remodelling our present laws or making new ones.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT HAS DONE.

President Buchanan has conducted our foreign affairs in a manner to reflect credit upon our government and to command the approbation of the whole country. The public revenue has been collected and disbursed in a manner unassailable and highly creditable to the country. The business of surveying and selling our public domain has been carried on to the satisfaction of all. Our Indian relations have been managed with justice and skill. The army has everywhere performed its duty, amid innumerable hardships, and fully met the expectations of the public. The navy has maintained its proud position and added to the reputation of our country abroad, as well as protected our commerce upon every sea. Its management is above reproach. The Post Office is daily extending its conveniences and its administration commands the confidence of the people throughout our almost boundless country. The public moneys have, in all branches of the public service, been collected and disbursed without loss of a dollar by defaulting agents. Public officers of every grade perform their duty with a capacity and perseverance and an integrity that challenges comparison with any portion of our past history. The supremacy of the laws is admitted in Utah, where, but yesterday, treason boasted of its power, and peace reigns in Kansas, instead of strife, civil war, and bloodshed.

Economy prevails in every branch of the executive government. Not a dollar is spent not authorized or required by law. Congress, in appropriating more than is asked for in the estimates of the executive government, and in requiring services and expenditures in conformity with their own views, assume to, and do order and direct expenses beyond the control of the President. Consequently, if the expenses of the government are larger than they ought to be, the remedy is with Congress, which controls and directs them. All know when Congress makes laws, whether wise or unwise, economical or extravagant, the President is bound to cause them to be executed.

The annual public accounts show that the expenses of Congress itself have increased faster than any other branch of the public service. Those of the government as a whole must increase with the extension of our territory and settlements. But, in my judgment, Congress can, and ought, to diminish them, first beginning with those of the two houses. I know it is the sincere desire of the President that retrenchment and reform shall be introduced by the laws of Congress to the greatest extent compatible with the good of the public service, and that he will lend all possible aid within his power to accomplish that most desirable object. It is well known that the firm stand taken and maintained by him against extravagance and his refusal to sign bills, when passed too late in the session to permit him to read and thoroughly examine them in all their details, has saved the country millions of dollars. Unfounded claims of immense magnitude have avoided his scrutiny, and appropriations of doubtful merit, and others deemed unconstitutional, have measurably ceased to be pressed, fearing investigations and his salutary veto. Let Congress enact the necessary legal provisions to diminish expenditures, and his past life is a guaranty that the President will faithfully execute them. His ambition is not to engage in future political contests, but so to serve the public while at the head of the government that his administration may constitute a bright page in our country's history. Since the day of his inauguration it has been fruitful of materials to compose one of which he, his friends, and the country may be justly proud. Neither hatred nor malice has been able to fix a stigma upon him. The breath of truth has scattered to the winds all efforts to do so, as it will in all future time. No stain will ever be fastened upon him. When passion and prejudice pass away all will do honor to his merits, as they now do to the memory of General Jackson, who was once more harshly assailed. In the great work of retrenchment and reform he will lead the democracy, from whom alone that good work is to be expected. No other party will ever engage in it. From the republican party no aid can be expected. Its present and past leaders have been the authors of numerous extravagances, and to a mountain of public debt in New York. Governor Seward, the very head and controlling spirit of that party, once recommended the State to add to its immense obligations forty millions of new debt.

His votes in the Senate show no change in his willingness to indulge in lavish expenditures at the public expense. The democracy have long fought the battle between economy and extravagance, and Hoffman's retrenchment act of 1842 and the constitution of 1846 are monuments commemorating their triumph in favor of reform. How perseveringly the leaders of the republican party fought against limiting expenditures and debt is known to you all, and is recorded in the history of the State. The same party, with scarcely an exception, press similar extravagances upon the national government. Once confer upon them the ability to do so, they will make ours the most extravagant government upon earth. The history of the past shows where the democracy stand, and where they stood in St. Lawrence county when they achieved triumphs over these very leaders upon this identical question, under the guidance of that wisest and best of men—SILAS WRIGHT. Those who loved him while living and cherish his memory since his death will never abandon the principles to which he devoted the best energies of his life. He was opposed to all public extravagance and needless expenditures.

WASHINGTON AND SILAS WRIGHT ON SECTIONAL AGITATION AND PARTIES.

Mr. Wright was emphatically opposed to whatever tended to create sectional jealousies or weakened the cords which bind the Union, as the following extract from a Fourth of July oration clearly proves. He quotes from Washington's Farewell Address: "In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs, as a matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations—*northern and southern*—*Atlantic and western*—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence in particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart-burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection;" and he then said, "Finally, fellow-citizens, let us cling to the constitution and the Union, as the surest and most efficient mode of promoting the cause of liberty in our own country, and thoughout the world. Let every obligation to both be discharged with wakeful vigilance, strict fidelity, and patriotic devotion. Let us remember that when the troubles (in the convention which framed the constitution) we have reviewed were met, encountered, and overcome, that but thirteen independent States were to be consulted and conciliated; that half a century of the prosperous workings of our glorious system has doubled the number of States, and swelled our population to sixteen or seventeen millions; that with this increase of States and population, and of consequent wealth and power, local and conflicting interests, sectional jealousies, rival feelings, and all the impediments to the formation of an efficient government and a perfect Union, which interposed themselves and almost overcame the resolution, patience, and hope of our revolutionary fathers, must have been proportionably increased. And let these remembrances strengthen our zeal and fortify our determination to preserve the constitution and the Union they formed for the increased millions over whom the blessings of both are daily and hourly diffused, and to transmit them unimpaired to the still increasing millions of freemen who will soon succeed us.

If there be any among us who, misled by a mistaken sympathy, or by sudden excitement upon any subject, are forgetting their obligations to the *whole country*, to the *constitution* and *Union*, let us use every effort of persuasion and example to awaken them to a sense of their dangerous error. If those who, for the sake of *private interest, personal ambition, or momentary political success*, are willing to experiment upon the public passions, to treat lightly their constitutional obligations, to foment sectional jealousies, and raise up geographical distinctions within the Union, let the absence of our countenance and support convince such that the personal gratification or public services of any living man are not objects of sufficient magnitude to be gained at the expense of the harmony of the country, the peace of the Union, or a single letter in the list of our constitutional duties. If among us there be any, which Heaven forbid, who are prepared for any earthly object to dismember our confederacy, and destroy that constitution which binds us together, let the fate of an Arnold be theirs, and let the detestation and scorn of every American be their constant companions, until, like him, they shall abandon a country whose rich blessings they are no longer worthy to enjoy.

Such is the language which he applied to those who are now combined in a political party using the very efforts condemned by him and Washington for the purposes of agitation, and to secure themselves a political elevation which other considerations have failed to accord to them. Who will say that he was wrong?

TONNAGE OF NEW YORK.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Oct. 19th.]

Our quarterly statement of the tonnage of this port, for the first two quarters of the current year, showed a marked decline as compared with the corresponding total for 1857. This has not been entirely recovered during the last three months, but there has been a very considerable gain upon the third quarter of last year, as will be seen from the annexed comparison:

Entered at New York from Foreign Ports for the Three Months ending September 30th, 1858.

	No. of vessels.	Tonnage.	No. seamen.
American vessels	726	407,188¼	11,760
Foreign vessels	345	151,388½	6,328
Total entered	1,071	558,576¾	18,088
Do. same time 1857	978	515,453¾	17,016
Do. same time 1856	1,135	564,840½	18,631
Do. same time 1855	836	394,300¼	12,456
Do. same time 1854	1,142	532,937½	17,173
Do. same time 1853	1,219	505,454½	17,147
Do. same time 1852	1,171	528,066½	17,843
Do. same time 1851	1,177	489,827¾	16,684
Do. same time 1850	984	378,830¼	14,319
Do. same time 1849	914	345,737	13,126

The total is nearly up to that of the third quarter of 1856, which showed a greater number of tons arrived than any similar quarter on our record.

We annex a comparative statement of the clearances for the same period, including only those to foreign ports:

Cleared at New York for foreign ports for the three months ending September 30, 1858.

	No of vessels.	Tonnage.	No. seamen.
American vessels	444	234,987¾	7,570
Foreign vessels	329	149,434½	5,878
Total cleared	773	384,422¼	13,448
Do. same time 1857	763	417,447¾	14,631
Do. same time 1856	889	466,226½	15,743
Do. same time 1855	720	345,006¼	11,625
Do. same time 1854	837	387,382½	13,592
Do. same time 1853	952	426,127¾	14,990
Do. same time 1852	873	395,230½	14,479
Do. same time 1851	792	334,685¼	12,487
Do. same time 1850	834	327,974¼	12,355
Do. same time 1849	693	265,440	10,526

The falling off in clearances to foreign ports is owing to the fact that a large number of vessels which arrived here from abroad have cleared for coastwise ports to load with cotton and other domestic produce, and, of course, are not included in the above total.

We have also compiled our usual summary of the coastwise commerce of this port for the quarter, as far as this can be done from the custom house records. As heretofore explained, a very large portion of our coastwise commerce does not appear upon the records; for, unless the vessels have foreign goods or distilled spirits on board, they have not been obliged to make any official acknowledgment of their arrival and departure. The official clearances coastwise are much more numerous than the entries, not only for the reason that many which arrive from abroad clear to load at some coastwise, but also because many vessels which take out foreign goods to domestic ports return laden only with domestic produce, and thus make no record of their arrival. Congress passed a law three years ago to authorize the perfection of these statistics, but we cannot learn that any arrangement has been made to give it effect at this port. The following is a copy of the official record:

Coastwise Commerce of New York for the Three Months ending September 30th.

	Entered Coastwise.		Cleared Coastwise.	
Year.	No. of vessels.	Tons.	No. of vessels.	Tons.
1849	368	69,763	956	217,700
1850	496	107,116	1,178	236,033
1851	398	102,631	1,258	285,564
1852	413	105,841	1,167	313,591
1853	408	112,053	1,285	338,810
1854	425	107,545	1,171	358,723
1855	511	143,302	1,182	365,901
1856	463	112,073	1,318	370,321
1857	436	118,796	1,198	384,184
1858	396	110,388	1,172	419,358

Included in the arrivals coastwise are 104 vessels, 48,874 under register, and 292, 61,514 under license; of the clearances, 325 vessels, 163,367 were under register, and 847, 255,991 under license. There is very little encouragement, just at present, for large vessels to remain and load at this port, and within a few days a number of our leading shipowners have chartered their vessels to load with cotton at Savannah, Charleston, Mobile, and New Orleans, directly for Europe. Quite a number of transient vessels have been engaged for the same service. In addition to this, nearly a score of large ships, mostly of the clipper fleet, have been chartered for San Francisco, some to load entirely with coal, and others to take assorted cargoes.

A case has just been decided by the supreme court of Michigan involving the rights of negroes to be carried on steamboats. A negro brought suit for damages because he was refused a cabin passage on board a steamer. The court decided that the plaintiff had a right to be conveyed by the steamer, but that it must be done in compliance with such reasonable regulations as the owners of the steamboat might see proper to establish. That the exclusion of the negro from the cabin was demanded by the custom of the country was therefore reasonable, and the negro had no right to claim to be carried in the cabin, even after the money had been tendered. Verdict for defendant.

The Indianapolis Sentinel explains the extra session of the legislature of that State to be necessary "to raise a State revenue upon the general levy of this year, to provide for the payment of the interest on the public debt, and to meet the current expenses of the government—a duty which the last legislature failed to perform. The legislature will also be called upon to pass a law for the reappraisement of the taxable property of the State, so as to equalize and make just this public burden upon its citizens.